Comes now the defendant, Vicki R. Seidel, by and through her attorneys of record, Robert Alan Jones and Chris Dietrich, and pursuant to Local Rule 7-11 moves for administrative relief requesting an evidentiary hearing regarding the invalidity of the underlying assessment. Also to review IRS procedures in levying in community property states that are the basis for the plaintiff's underlying claims in the instant case. We request that said hearing be set for the July 6, 2007 hearing scheduled in the instant case, or at the earliest practicable date.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that the Court grant the instant motion and grant an evidentiary hearing on the motion for preliminary injunction be set for the July 6, 2007 hearing

Case No. C 07-3141 JF MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

scheduled in the instant case or at the earliest practicable date.

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES.

The instant motion is brought pursuant Local Civil Rules 7-11, 65, 7-2, 7-4 and Federal Civil Rule 65 for the Court to grant an evidentiary hearing in order for the Plaintiff to present evidence regarding bitterly disputed facts that are at the heart of the pending motions. In this instance there is a true necessity for an evidentiary hearing. "Rule 65 does not [always] require an evidentiary hearing;" undisputed material facts require no hearing, but "bitterly disputed" facts do. See, McDonald's Corp. V. Robertson, 147 F.3d 1301, 1311-13 (11th Cir. 1998).

Further, counsel for the plaintiff have contacted, AUSA David Denier, the government attorney assigned to this case. AUSA Denier when informed of the request for evidentiary hearing stated that the government would oppose such hearing and move to quash any subpoenas issued for such hearing. (See Declaration of James D. Arthur, Exhibit 1).

At the requested hearing, Plaintiff will produce an expert witness who will testify both as an expert and as a fact witness regarding the invalidity of the underlying assessment. It is expected that the government will dispute Plaintiff's claim. Proper evidence under the Federal Rules of Evidence will be required to resolve this dispute.

DATED: This 23rd day of June, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Robert Alan Jones
Robert Alan Jones, Esq.
Pro hac vice
RAJ LIMITED, PC
1061 East Flamingo Road, Suite #7
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
(702) 791-0742 Telephone
(702) 736-0773 Facsimile
Rajltd@aol.com

/s/ Chris Dietrich CHRIS DIETRICH, Bar No. 092592 11300 West Olympic Boulevard Suite 800 Los Angeles, California 90064 (310) 312-6888

Case No. C 07-3141 JF MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF

1 2

4 5

3

6 7

8

10 11

12

13

1415

16 17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that on June 23, 2007, I caused to be served the foregoing MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE RELEIF, using the electronic court filing system, and will be distributed to all parties shortly after its filing.

United States Attorney
Scott N. Schools
United States Attorney's Office
450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415-436-7200)

Attorney General Alberto Gonzales U.S. Department of Justice 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20530-0001 (202-353-1555)

Commissioner of Internal Revenue Mark W. Everson 1111 Constitution Avenue NW Washington, DC 20224-0002

Additionally: by fax:

AUSA David L. Denier 9TH FLOOR FEDERAL BUILDING 450 Golden Gate Ave. Box 36055 San Francisco, CA 94102 (408) 535-5163 Fax: (415) 436-6748 david.denier@usdoj.gov

Dated this 23rd day of June, 2007.

/s/ Stephanie Burton
Office of Robert Alan Jones

Case No. C 07-3141 JF MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28